

Dynamical Correlation Theory for an Escape Process

Ping Ao

Department of Physics, FM-15

University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

February 1, 2008

Abstract

A dynamical theory which incorporates the electron-electron correlations and the effects of external magnetic fields for an electron escaping from a helium surface is presented. The degrees of freedom in the calculation of the escape rate is reduced from $3N$ to 3 as compared with other approach. Explicit expressions for the escape rate in various situations are obtained. In particular, in the weak parallel magnetic field limit the tunneling rate has an exponential dependence quadratic with magnetic field strength and an unusual exponential increase linear with temperature.

PACS#s: 73.40.Gk; 71.45.Gm; 73.20.Dx

When many electrons sit in a metastable well near a helium surface, the escape of an electron from the well is no longer a single particle problem due to the Coulomb interaction. Electron-electron (e-e) correlations play an essential role in the escape process and the physics becomes very rich. This system is ideal to test our understandings of the escape from a metastable well when many body effects are important. A number of experiments have been performed on the escaping of electrons from a helium surface.?? Recent theoretical studies have mainly concentrated on how the static e-e correlations affect the escape rate. A comprehensive understanding has been obtained in treating the e-e correlations as either instantaneous following the motion of an escaping electron or not following it at all.?? The real dynamical nature of the e-e correlations, however, has not been explored adequately. As one can see from a rather similar problem of the escaping of a particle from a metastable well in the presence of an environment, the dynamical response can be dominant.?? In the present paper we develop a dynamical theory for the escaping of an electron from a helium surface to account for the effects of both static and dynamical e-e correlations and magnetic fields. The original $3N$ degree freedom problem?? is simplified to a 3 degree freedom one, with N the total number of electrons in the problem. Expressions in various limits for the escape rate in the terms of temperature, 2-d electron density, and external magnetic fields are obtained. Particularly, an unusual exponential increase linear with temperature of the tunneling rate in the presence of a weak parallel magnetic field is found. The dependence on the magnetic field is quadratic in exponent in this limit.

We consider the experimental relevant situation in which the lifetime of the metastable state of an electron is much longer than the relaxation time of the 2-d electrons and the density of 2-d electrons is low such that the Fermi temperature is the smallest energy in the problem. The escaping events are then statistically independent of each other and the exchange effect of an escaping electron with 2-d electrons can be ignored. A separation

between the escaping electron and the remaining 2-d electrons for each escape event can be made. For simplicity, we shall ignore the weaker interactions of the escaping electron to the surface waves of liquid helium and the helium vapor atoms, which has been discussed elsewhere??.

We start with the derivation of the effective Hamiltonian for the escaping electron classically. This Hamiltonian will be the base to study the escape process. For quantum tunneling, an imaginary time path integral method following Ref.[13] will be used. The classical equation of motion for the escaping electron is:

$$m \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \mathbf{R}_t = -\nabla V_0(z_t) + \frac{e}{c} \frac{d\mathbf{R}_t}{dt} \times \mathbf{B}_{ex} + e \mathbf{E}_{in}(\mathbf{R}_t) , \quad (1)$$

with $V_0(z) = V_w(z) + V_i(z) + V_n(z)$. Here m is the mass of an electron, e is the negative electron charge, c is speed of light, and V_w is the hardwall potential, $V_w = \infty$ for $z < 0$, $V_w = 0$ for $z > 0$. This potential mimics the fact that it costs energy $\sim 1\text{eV}$ for an electron to go into the liquid helium, which is very large in the present problem. The image potential V_i due to the polarization of helium liquid is $V_i(z) = -e^2\Lambda/z$, with $\Lambda = (\epsilon - 1)/4(\epsilon + 1)$. The dielectric constant of liquid helium $\epsilon = 1.057$. The potential V_n is the total electric potential produced by the external applied electric field (perpendicular only) and the electric field produced by the mean density n_0 of the 2-d electrons,

$$V_n(z) = -e[E_{ex} + 2\pi e(1 - 4\Lambda)n_0]z . \quad (2)$$

The condition for 2-d electron escaping to $z = \infty$ from the surface is $E_{ex} + 2\pi e(1 - 4\Lambda)n_0 < 0$. The external applied magnetic field is $\mathbf{B}_{ex}$, and $\mathbf{E}_{in}$ is the electric field produced by the 2-d electron density deviated from n_0 .

The induced electric field $\mathbf{E}_{in}$ is generated by the 2-d density deviation from the mean value n_0 , which in turn is induced by the escaping electron. Consequently, $\mathbf{E}_{in}$ can be expressed in terms of the motion of the escaping electron. The procedure is as follows.

Let the 2-d electron fluid sit on the surface of the liquid helium, the $x - y$ plane. The fluid is described by a set of hydrodynamical equations: the continuity equation and the Euler's equation. In the small density deviation and the nonrelativistic limit, we linearize the hydrodynamical equations. We solve for the density deviation, which is presented by the motion of the plasma modes. Then using the Poisson equation we obtain the induced electric field as??

$$\mathbf{E}_{in}(\mathbf{R}_t) = -\nabla \int d\mathbf{k} \int d\omega \frac{n_0 e^3}{m} \frac{1}{\omega^2 - \omega_P^2(k)} \int \frac{dt'}{2\pi} \exp\{-kz_{t'}\} \exp\{-i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{t'} - \omega t')\} \\ (1 - 4\Lambda)^2 \exp\{-kz_t\} \exp\{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_t - \omega t)\}. \quad (3)$$

Here the plasma dispersion relation $\omega_P(k)$ in eq.(3) is

$$\omega_P^2(k) = \omega_B^2 + \frac{n_0 e^2}{m} 2\pi k(1 - 4\Lambda) + \frac{k_B T}{m} k^2, \quad (4)$$

and the cyclotron frequency $\omega_B = eB_{\perp ex}/mc$ with $B_{\perp ex}$ the component of the external magnetic field perpendicular to the helium surface. In the calculation the pressure $p = nk_B T$ for the 2-d classical electron fluid phase has been used.

The induced electric field is contributed by the response of the environment, the plasma modes of 2-d electrons, to the motion of the escaping electron. Hence we are dealing a problem similar to the one in the discussion of the macroscopic quantum effect??, where the total Hamiltonian has three parts, a dissipative environment consisting of harmonic oscillators, a system of interesting, and the coupling between the system and the environment. Using this analogy, we find that the following effective Hamiltonian is equivalent to eqs.(1,3) to describe the motion of the escaping electron:

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \left[\mathbf{P} - \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ex} \right]^2 + V_A(z) + \int_{k < g\sqrt{n_0}} d\mathbf{k} \sum_{j=1,2} \left[\frac{1}{2m} p_j^2(\mathbf{k}) + \frac{1}{2} m \omega_P^2(k) \times \right. \\ \left. \left(q_j(\mathbf{k}) - \frac{e\sqrt{n_0}e^2(1 - 4\Lambda) \exp\{-kz\}c_j}{m\omega_P^2(k)} \right)^2 \right], \quad (5)$$

with

$$V_A(z) = V_0(z) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{g\sqrt{n_0}} dk \, 2\pi k \frac{n_0 e^4 (1 - 4\Lambda)^2}{m\omega_P^2(k)} \exp\{-2kz\}, \quad (6)$$

and $c_1 = \cos(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r})$, $c_2 = \sin(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r})$, $\mathbf{B}_{ex} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}_{ex}$. Here g is a numerical factor of order unit to be discussed below. The choice of the effective Hamiltonian is chosen in a form as in Ref.[14] in the discussion of the dissipative bath in quantum tunneling. When 2-d electrons follow the motion of the escaping electron completely, the so called the adiabatic limit, the response of 2-d electrons is described by the adiabatic potential given by eq.(6). The deviation from the adiabatic response is described by the plasma dynamics, the last term in eq.(5). The second term of eq.(6) corresponding to the correlation potential discussed in Ref.[1]. Hence an alternative justification of its usage in Refs.[1-5] is obtained here. Several features of the effective Hamiltonian should be pointed out. The coupling between the escaping electron and the plasma is highly nonlinear in the coordinate of the escaping electron. The damping of the escaping electron due to plasma is clearly superohmic case, when $B_{\perp ex} \neq 0$. It is also superohmic when $B_{\perp ex} = 0$, a situation similar to the polaron problem. The effective Hamiltonian contains a weak temperature dependent through the plasma frequency, which comes from the equilibrium state of the electron fluid. The potential $V_A(z)$ is influenced by $B_{\perp ex}$ through the plasma frequency ω_B dependence.

Because the average distance between electrons is $1/\sqrt{n_0}$, there is no plasma mode of large wavenumbers $k \gg \sqrt{n_0}$. Furthermore, the 2-d electron density deviation is large in this regime and the linearization approximation leading to eqs.(3,4) is not accurate. Then we need to introduce a cutoff plasma frequency $\omega_c = \sqrt{2\pi g n_0^{3/2} e^2 / m}$ corresponding to $k \sim g\sqrt{n_0}$ which determines the fastest response of the plasma, as shown in Ref.[16]. This would suggest that we could only determine the numerical factor g in eq.(6) to be an order of unit, and the radius of the hole created by the escaping electron pushing 2-d electrons sideward to be the order of $1/\sqrt{n_0}$. However, g can be theoretically determined accurately in the

following way: Let the escaping electron sit in the center of the hole created by itself in 2-d electrons. Because of the rotational symmetry there is no net force from 2-d electrons acting on the escaping electron. The escaping electron only feels the externally applied force, *i.e.*, $-\nabla V_A|_{hole\ center} = eE_{ex}\hat{z}$. The choice of g must satisfy this condition. Therefore we have $g = 2\sqrt{\pi}$. This completes the derivation of the effective Hamiltonian eq.(5).

The effective Hamiltonian may have a wider application region than the region of validity of the hydrodynamical approach, so long as elementary excitations, such as the plasma modes calculated above, dominate the response of the 2-d electrons to the escaping electron. For example, this may include the case of the Wigner lattice phase. In this case, the plasma modes will be replaced by the phonon modes. One can expect that the form of the effective hamiltonian is the same as eq.(5) in the long wave length limit when $B_{\perp ex} = 0$, because the density deviation is the same longitudinal one. As the local structure of 2-d electrons is not changed in the Kosterlitz-Thouless transition, we then expect the same short distance behavior. Then there should be no change of the adiabatic potential therefore no change of the escape rate cross the melting temperature. This is consistent with a recent experiment.??

We now calculate the escape rate starting from eq.(5) for various situations. In the high temperature regime, the escape is dominated by the thermal activation. The escape rate is $\Gamma_T = A \exp\{-\mathcal{E}_b/k_B T\}$. Here the prefactor A is weakly temperature dependent and is proportional to the density of 2-d electrons. The barrier height $\mathcal{E}_b$ is determined by the equation $\mathcal{E}_b = V_A(z_{max}) - \mathcal{E}_0$, where z_{max} is the position of the barrier top. The metastable (ground) state energy $\mathcal{E}_0$ is directly calculated from the effective Hamiltonian of eq.(5) as

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = -\frac{e^2\Lambda}{2a'_B} - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{g\sqrt{n_0}} dk \frac{2\pi k e^4 n_0}{m\omega_P^2(k)} (1 - 4\Lambda)^2, \quad (7)$$

with $a'_B = \hbar^2/me^2\Lambda$. Much weaker influences from the Stark shift and vertical spread of 2-d electrons have been ignored. If we ignore its small effect on the ground state energy, there

is no influence of the parallel magnetic field $B_{\parallel ex}$ on the thermal activation rate. On the contrast, the activation rate will be increased in the presence of a perpendicular magnetic field $B_{\perp ex}$, because $B_{\perp ex}$ affects the potential $V_A(z)$ in a special way. Specifically, we find that the barrier height $\mathcal{E}_b$ in the weak field limit as:

$$\mathcal{E}_b = \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_b|_{B_{\perp ex}=0} - 2\sqrt{\pi n_0} z_{max} \left(\frac{\omega_B}{\omega_c}\right)^2 (1 - 4\Lambda) 2e^2 \sqrt{\pi n_0}, & 2\sqrt{\pi n_0} z_{max} \ll 1, \\ \mathcal{E}_b|_{B_{\perp ex}=0} - \left(\frac{\omega_B}{\omega_c}\right)^2 \ln\left(\frac{\omega_c}{\omega_B}\right) (1 - 4\Lambda) 2e^2 \sqrt{\pi n_0}, & 2\sqrt{\pi n_0} z_{max} \gg 1. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

This result may be interpreted as that $B_{\perp ex}$ effectively reduces the interaction between the 2-d electrons and the escaping electron. For a strong magnetic field we should pointed out that the short magnetic length scale introduced by the strong magnetic field may indicate the invalid of the present hydrodynamics approach.

In the low temperature region quantum tunneling dominates the escape. The tunneling rate is $\Gamma_Q = \omega_a \exp\{-S_c/\hbar\}$. The prefactor ω_a is of an order of $\mathcal{E}_0/\hbar$. The classical action $S_c = S_{eff}[\mathbf{R}_c(\tau)]$ is evaluated at the classical trajectory $\mathbf{R}_c(\tau)$ determined by the equation $\delta S_{eff}[\mathbf{R}(\tau)] = 0$ which is a 3 instead of $2N + 1$ dimensional partial differential equation, with the effective action S_{eff} as??

$$S_{eff}[\mathbf{R}(\tau)] = S_0[\mathbf{R}(\tau)] + \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau \int d\tau' \int d\mathbf{k} \frac{n_0 e^4 (1 - 4\Lambda)^2}{4m\omega_P(k)} \exp\{-\omega_P(k)|\tau - \tau'|\} \\ \left\{ [\exp\{-kz(\tau)\} - \exp\{-kz(\tau')\}]^2 + 2 \exp\{-k(z(\tau) + z(\tau'))\} [1 - \cos[\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r}(\tau) - \mathbf{r}(\tau'))]] \right\}, \quad (9)$$

with

$$S_0[\mathbf{R}(\tau)] = \int d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2} m \dot{\mathbf{R}}^2(\tau) + i \frac{e}{c} \mathbf{A}_{ex} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{R}} + V_A(z(\tau)) \right]. \quad (10)$$

The nonlocal term in time in eq.(9) is a result of the reduction of the degrees of freedom from $3N$ to 3. Numerical calculation can be used in order to make a detailed comparison to experiments. In the following we discuss some prominent features of the tunneling rate analytically.

First, we consider the case of the zero parallel magnetic field $B_{\parallel ex} = 0$. If we drop the last and non-negative term in eq.(9), replace $\dot{\mathbf{R}}^2$ by $\dot{z}^2$ in eq.(10), and apply the 1-d WKB approximation, we obtain a lower bound of the classical action S_c :

$$S_{lower} = 2 \int_{z_1}^{z_2} dz \sqrt{2m[V_A(z) - \mathcal{E}_0]} , \quad (11)$$

with z_1 and z_2 the turning points which are the solutions of the equation $V_A(z) - \mathcal{E}_0 = 0$. The tunneling rate calculated in this way gives the upper bound for the tunneling rate as pointed out in Refs.[10,11] This upper bound of tunneling rate corresponds to the physical situation in which the 2-d electrons follow the motion of the escaping electron instantaneously, the adiabatic limit, as a general theorem has shown.?? The classical trajectory corresponding the case in which $\mathbf{r}(\tau) = \text{constant}$ therefore $1 - \cos[\mathbf{k} \cdot (\mathbf{r}(\tau) - \mathbf{r}(\tau'))] = 0$ (note $B_{\parallel ex} = 0$). Setting $\exp\{-kz(\tau')\} = 1$, integrating over τ' , and again using the 1-d WKB approximation, we obtain an upper bound for S_c from eq.(9):

$$S_{upper} = 2 \int_{z'_1}^{z'_2} dz \sqrt{2m[V_U(z) - \mathcal{E}_0]} , \quad (12)$$

with z'_1 and z'_2 the turning points which are the solution of the equation $V_U(z) - \mathcal{E}_0 = 0$. Here the potential $V_U(z)$ is

$$V_U(z) = V_A(z) + \frac{1}{4} \int_0^{g\sqrt{n_0}} dk \frac{2\pi k e^4 n_0 (1 - \Lambda)^2}{m\omega_P^2(k)} (\exp\{-kz\} - 1)^2 . \quad (13)$$

This upper bound for S_c is smaller than that given by the frozen potential??, and is a better one. This is due to the partial inclusion of the dynamics of the plasma modes.

The tunneling rate increases as $B_{\perp ex}^2$ in the low field limit because of the suppression of the correlation potential discussed in the case of thermal activation rate. There is another reason for the increase of tunneling rate, the increase of the adiabaticity: If we fix the adiabatic potential $V_A(z)$, and allow the plasma frequencies to increase independently, then the e-e response will be able to follow the motion of escaping electron more closely, and

S_c decreases towards its lower bound, $S_c \rightarrow S_{lower}$, the adiabatic limit. This result is the opposite of Ref.[10]. Because the damping is superohmic, the temperature dependence due to damping in the tunneling regime is found to behave as $O(T^7)$ and is small in the low temperature limit.??

Now we discuss the case that the parallel magnetic field is present, $B_{\parallel ex} \neq 0$ and $B_{\perp ex} = 0$. By choosing the parallel magnetic field along the x -direction and $\mathbf{A}_{ex} = (0, -B_{\parallel ex}z, 0)$, according to the effective Hamiltonian eq.(5) we have the first two terms as

$$H_0 = \frac{1}{2m}P_z^2 + V_A(z) + \frac{1}{2m} \left[P_y + \frac{e}{c}B_{\parallel ex}z \right]^2. \quad (14)$$

The x -direction motion is irrelevant. This Hamiltonian describes the 1-d motion of a particle coupling to a harmonic oscillator with a zero frequency. We integrate over the y coordinate to obtain the effective action for the motion in z direction as

$$S_{eff}[z(\tau)] = \int d\tau \left[\frac{1}{2}m\dot{z}^2(\tau) + V_A(z(\tau)) \right] + \frac{1}{4m} \left(\frac{eB_{\parallel ex}}{c} \right)^2 \frac{k_B T}{\hbar} \int d\tau \int d\tau' [z(\tau) - z(\tau')]^2. \quad (15)$$

This result suggests that the y direction motion acting as a dissipative environment to the z direction motion.?? The influence action from the plasma modes is ignored by assuming the adiabatic limit for simplicity, which will be discussed below. In the small field limit, the classical trajectory remains unchanged. The classical action can then be evaluated perturbatively:

$$S_c = S_{lower} + \frac{1}{2m} \left(\frac{eB_{\parallel ex}}{c} \right)^2 \int d\tau z_c^2(\tau) - \frac{1}{2m} \left(\frac{eB_{\parallel ex}}{c} \right)^2 \frac{k_B T}{\hbar} \left(\int d\tau z_c(\tau) \right)^2, \quad (16)$$

with semiclassical trajectory $z_c(\tau)$ determined by the usual equation $\frac{1}{2}m\dot{z}_c^2 = V_A(z_c) - \mathcal{E}_0$. The tunneling rate decreases at zero temperature because of the bending of classical trajectory, and increases exponentially with temperature because of the excitation of the y -direction motion, with a $B_{\parallel ex}^2$ dependence on the parallel magnetic field. In the calculation we have ignored a weak dependence of $\mathcal{E}_0$ on $B_{\parallel ex}$.

We have discussed the crossing from thermal activation to quantum tunneling, the effect of the correlation potential, the dynamical response of the 2-d electrons to the escaping electron, and the effect of weak parallel magnetic field. We now discuss the conditions to observe these effects. Let $\omega_b^2 = |V_A''(z_{max})|/m$ be the small oscillation frequency in the inverse potential $-V_A(z)$. The crossing from thermal activation to quantum tunneling occurs at $k_B T_0 = \hbar \omega_b$ according to the standard theory.?? The frequency ω_b also determines the dynamics of the escaping electron in the inverse potential. In order for the 2-d electrons to follow the motion of the escaping electron, the cutoff plasma frequency should satisfies the inequality $\omega_c > \omega_b$, and then the tunneling is essentially an adiabatic process??. Similarly, the condition for the weak parallel magnetic field $B_{\parallel ex}$ is $eB_{\parallel ex}/mc < \omega_b$. To manifest the correlation effect in the escape process, we need $\sqrt{n_0}z_{max} \geq 1$ in the case of the thermal activation, and $\sqrt{n_0}z_2 \geq 1$ in the case of quantum tunneling, otherwise the correlation effect is small.

Finally, let us make a brief comparison to experiments. The present theory is in agreement with experiments in the thermal activation regime, where consistent experimental data exist.?? The existing quantum tunneling data in the absence of magnetic field?? do not agree with each other and there is no satisfactory explanation. However, the magnetic field dependent tunneling results obtained in the present paper, the quadratic dependence on the parallel magnetic field and linear in temperature, agree with a recent experiment described in Ref.[5].

Acknowledgements: The author thanks A.J. Leggett for suggesting this problem and for sharing of his physics insight. Discussions with A.J. Dahm, J.M. Goodkind, J. Rammer, and at various stages of the work are appreciated. The author is particularly grateful to E.Y. Andrei for bringing the data of Ref.[5] to his attention prior to its publication. This work was supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation at University

of Illinois, and by the US National Science Foundation under Grant # DMR 89-16052.

References

1. Y. Iye, K. Kono, K. Kajita, and W. Sasaki, J. Low Temp. Phys. **38**, 293 (1980).
2. K. Kono, K. Kajita, S.I. Kobayashi, and W. Sasaki, J. Low Temp. Phys. **46**, 195 (1982).
3. J.M. Goodkind, G.F. Saville, A. Ruckentein, and P.M. Platzman, Phys. Rev. **B 38**, 8778 (1988).
4. E.Y. Andrei, S. Yucel, and L. Menna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3704 (1991).
5. S. Yucel, L. Menna, and E.Y. Andrei, J. Low Temp. Phys. **89**, 257 (1992); L. Menna, S. Yucel, and E.Y. Andrei, preprint.
6. S. Nagano, S. Ichimaru, H. Totsuji, and N. Itoh, Phys. Rev. **B 19**, 2449(1979).
7. Y.M. Vilk and Y.P. Monarhkar, Fiz. Nizk. Temp. **13**, 684 (1987) [Sov. J. Low Temp. Phys. **13**, 392 (1987)].
8. M.Y. Azbel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 1553(1990).
9. S. Yücel and E.Y. Andrei, Phys. Rev. **B42**, 2088 (1990).
10. M. Azbel and P.M. Platzman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1376(1990).
11. P. Ao, Ph.D. thesis, chapter 3, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1991 (unpublished).
12. H.A. Kramers, Physica **7**, 284 (1940).
13. A.O. Caldeira and A.J. Leggett, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **149**, 374 (1983); **153**, 445(1984)(E).
14. A.J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. **B 30**, 1208 (1984).
15. For a recent review, see for example, P. Hänggi, P. Talkner, and M. Borkovec, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 251(1990).
16. K.I. Golden, G. Kalman, and P. Wyns, Phys. Rev. **A41**, 6940 (1990).
17. A.J. Leggett and G. Baym, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 191 (1989).
18. A.J. Leggett, in *Granular Nanoelectronics*, edited by D.K. Ferry, J.R. Barker, and C.

Jacobini, Plenum, New York, 1991.